User Evaluation

"Mathochist Studios" Cohort 4, Team 11

Euan Cottam
Charlie Thoo-Tinsley
Harri Thorman
Will King
Zach Moussallati
Aiden Turner
Marcus Williamson
Joshua Zacek

User Evaluation Report

For our user evaluation we used a task based user evaluation system in which we first outlined 5 simpler tasks for users to complete (e.g. to collect 5 coins) with an overarching goal of attaining as many achievements as possible whilst following through with these tasks, with a mix of quantitative and qualitative evaluation questions after. Our playtesters were sourced from other teams in our cohort, and contact was kept with these teams so that we could easily find new testers for a second round of user evaluations we held over the Winter break. Each round had 10 playtesters, with no playtesters participating in both rounds. We used Google forms to source and collate data from our playtesters. This choice was made due to group members having prior experience with the tools, as well as its availability and convenience.

For our first set of tests, we had a group member sit with the user and walk them through their objectives before giving them 5 minutes to freely play through the game. We then asked them to give scores to components of our game, including but not limited to; UI, smoothness of control, difficulty of each task and general enjoyment. We then gave them an open ended question where they could freely highlight any issues they had with the game, and areas they'd like to be improved. These are highlighted in our usability problems table on the next page. We also collected a few optional and voluntary pieces of demographic information, with the aim of ensuring that we were catering to our intended audience and that we were meeting our inclusivity goals (colour blind safe etc.)

For our second set of tests, held three weeks later and after making design changes guided by our first round of user evaluation, we requested a new group of participants to once again go through the same set of tasks and provide us with the same feedback categories, using a new participant group here to avoid learning effects. These tests were held remotely for convenience, with participants having the ability to contact a supervising group member at any time if an issue arose. This worked because the general framework of the game had all been implemented already by our first round of usability testing, and allowed us to more accurately see if our initial usability problems had been addressed and resolved.

Responses from both sets of tests have been reviewed, and common issues have been grouped into usability problems and can be seen in the table on the next page.

Usability Problems

User Evaluation Group One (12/12/25)

Usability Problem	Average Severity	Solution
The doorway sprites are confusing and some users struggled to find them	3/5	Redesign the doorway sprites to make them clearer
Vagueness in the shop section. What are users able to buy and what do they do	4/5	Make effects of shop items more apparent, and add a popup to show that they can be purchased
The duck should play a more active role in the game	1/5	The duck has been made into an important hidden feature
Unclear that we had to collect money for the bus at the end of the game	4/5	Money is no longer needed to beat the game. Obstacles are what prevent the user from reaching the end, with coins amplifying user score and allowing for item purchase
Mini map is vague and some users struggled to read it	3/5	General overhaul of much of the UI to improve readability and screen at the beginning of the game to convey controls

User Evaluation Group Two (5/1/25)

Usability Problem	Average Severity	Solution
Users didn't feel the game related enough to the university	3/5	Update game sprites to better relate to the university (central hall, new duck sprites)
Bug in the pause menu that caused users to sometimes quit out as the button to close the menu overlapped with the quit button	5/5	Add a check so that the quit button wouldn't work when the menu was opening and shortly after it closed